

## **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed, and reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

### **CLAIM REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a)**

Claims 1, 4, 8 and 9 were originally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rodgers (US-5,903,212) in view of Cheng (US-5,860,724).

In addition, claim 5 was originally rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rodgers and Cheng as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Vanderschuit (US-6,416,198).

However, the Examiner has pointed out that claims 6, 7 and 10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Responsive to this, claims 2, 5 and 6 are deleted, and claim 1 is amended which is substantially the combination of original claims 1, 2, 5 and 6 so as to make the claimed invention more distinguishably patentable over the prior art references cited by the Examiner.

Accordingly, by the amendments, it is believed that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) should be withdrawn, and the amended claim 1 should be allowable.

It is further submitted that the claims 3, 4 and 7-10 should be allowable as they are dependent upon the amended claim 1 which is believed to be allowable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that the application is now in a condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Chin-Lai Su

Applicant

Chin-Lai Su

58, MA YUAN WEST ST.,

TAICHUNG, TAIWAN